UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,375	01/22/2001	Hemal V. Shah	10559-419001/P10488	2369

20985	7590	04/08/2004

FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
12390 EL CAMINO REAL
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081

EXAMINER
CHANKONG, DOHM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	6

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 December 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4, 5/30/2001*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.　　Claims 1-23 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2.　　It is noted that although the present application does contain line numbers in the specification, there are no line numbers in the claims. The preferred format for numbering the claims is to number each line of every claim, with each claim beginning with line 1. For ease of reference by both the Office and Applicant <u>all</u> future correspondence should include the recommended line numbering. For the purposes of this Action, this is the format used by Examiner when referencing lines in a claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.　　The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.　　Claims 1, 4-5, 14-16, 19, 20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitbon et al (hereinafter Sitbon), U.S Patent No. 5,568,487 in view of Mastie et al (hereinafter Mastie), U.S Patent No. 6,145,031.

5.　　As to claim 1, Sitbon teaches a method comprising:

examining a call and a file descriptor associated with the call in an application node of network (column 2, lines 19-32); and

if the call and the file descriptor are of a first type, translating the call to a protocol recognized by a second node in the network and communicating the translated call to the second node (column 2, lines 19-43).

Sitbon does not teach that the network is a system area network.

6.   Mastie teaches it is well known in the art that a network can be interchangeably implemented as a TCP/IP, internet or System Area Network (column 4, lines 20-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Sitbon's TCP/IP network as a System area network so Sitbon's conversion method can be applied to a variety of networks.

7.   As to claim 4, Sitbon teaches a method including mapping a communications identifier, received in the application node from the second node, to the file descriptor (column 9, line 66 to column 10, line 12 and line 30 – where the communications identifier is the protocol address).

8.   As to claim 5, Sitbon teaches a network comprising:

a first node (column 2, line 13 and column 9, lines 13-16 and lines 22-25 where the "client" is the node); and

an application node including a processor (column 2, lines 33-36) configured for:

examining a call and a file descriptor associated with the call in an application

node of network (column 2, line 13 and lines 19-32); and

if the call and the file descriptor are of a first type, translating the call to a

protocol recognized by a second node in the network and communicating the

translated call to the second node (column 2, lines 19-43).

Sitbon does not teach that the network is a system area network.

9.   Mastie teaches it is well known in the art that a network can be interchangeably

implemented as a TCP/IP, internet or System Area Network (column 4, lines 20-21). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to implement Sitbon's TCP/IP network as a system area network so Sitbon's

conversion method can be applied to a variety of networks.

10.   As to claim 14, Sitbon teaches a network wherein the application node further

includes an operating system for assigning the file descriptor (column 3, lines 1-8 and lines

47-57).

11.   As to claim 15, Sitbon teaches a network wherein the processor is further configured

for mapping a communications identifier, received in the application node, to the file

descriptor (column 9, line 66 to column 10, line 12 and line 30 – where the communications

identifier is the protocol address).

12.   As to claim 16, Sitbon teaches an apparatus (Figure 1, item w) comprising:

a port for connecting the apparatus to a network (column 3, lines 26-35 and

line 66); and

a processor (Figure 2, items SBT, LIB, KE) configured for:

examining a call and a file descriptor associated with the call in an application

node of network (column 2, line 13 and lines 19-32); and

if the call and the file descriptor are of a first type, translating the call to a

protocol recognized by a second node in the network and communicating the translated call

to the second node (column 2, lines 19-43).

13.   As to claim 16, Sitbon does not explicitly show the use of a system area network;

however it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Sitbon by including the use of a system area network in view

of Mastie for the same reasons set forth in claim 5, supra.

14.   As to claim 19, Sitbon teaches an apparatus wherein the processor is further

configured for mapping a communications identifier, received at the apparatus, to the file

descriptor (column 9, line 66 to column 10, line 12 and line 30 – where the communications

identifier is the protocol address).

15.   Claim 20 is a claim to an article which performs the actions of the method of claim 1.

Therefore, claim 20 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1, supra.

16.   Claim 22 is a claim to an article which performs the actions of the method of claim 3. Therefore, claim 22 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 3, supra.

17.   Claim 23 is a claim to an article which performs the actions of the method of claim 4. Therefore, claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 4, supra.

18.   Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitbon and Mastie as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Subramaniam et al (hereinafter Subramaniam), U.S Patent No. 6,081,900.

19.   As to claim 2, Sitbon teaches a method including processing the call at the application node if the call and file descriptor are of a second type (column 3, lines 1-25 and lines 57-67) but does not explicitly teach using an operating system in the application node.

20.   Subramaniam teaches that an application node (server in Sitbon) contains an operating system (column 12, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Sitbon's call processing method using an operating system at the application node as the operating system would help in the operation of the application node and also well known and expected in the art for Sitbon's server node to contain a processor with an operating system.

21.   As to claim 3, Sitbon teaches a method including assigning the file descriptor of the

application node (column 3, lines 1-8 and lines 47-57) but does not explicitly teach using an

operating system to assign the file descriptor.

22.   Subramaniam teaches that an application node (server in Sitbon) contains an

operating system (column 12, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to implement Sitbon's file descriptor method

using an operating system at the application node as the operating system would help in the

operation of the application node and also well known and expected in the art for Sitbon's

server node to contain a processor with an operating system.

23.   Claims 6-7 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sitbon and Mastie in view of claim 5 above, in view of Beddus et al (hereinafter Beddus),

U.S Patent No. 6,694,375.

24.   As to claim 6, Sitbon teaches a network including a network node (column 9, lines 13-

16) but not a first node that is a proxy node including a processor configured for translating

the call to a protocol recognized by the network node.

25.   Beddus teaches a first node that is a proxy node including a processor configured for

translating for translating the call to a protocol recognized by the network node (column 2,

lines 5-8 and lines 50-56 and column 7, lines 43-54). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a proxy node with

processor in Sitbon's client so that the client can perform protocol conversion of messages so

it can properly communicate with the server.

26.   As to claim 7, Sitbon does not teach a network wherein the processor is further

configured for translating a call to a lightweight protocol message.

27.   Beddus teaches a network wherein the processor is further configured for translating a

call to a lightweight protocol message (column 7, line 60 to column 8, line 5). Therefore it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify Sitbon's processor so it could translate calls to lightweight protocol messages

to communicate with the OSI network as Official Notice is taken that a lightweight protocol

(LDAP) is typically used in OSI networks.

28.   As to claim 10, Sitbon does not teach a network wherein the processor is configured

for translating the call to a lightweight protocol message using a lightweight protocol

message received from the first node.

29.   Beddus teaches a network wherein the processor is configured for translating the call

to a lightweight protocol message using a lightweight protocol message received from the

first node (Figure 6, column 7, line 42 to column 8, line 11 - where the first lightweight

message sent establishes the user profile of the user which is used by the client to establish a

call). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sitbon to include Beddus' call translation functionality so the client can easily communicate with an LDAP server without having to modify its calls.

30.   As to claim 11, Sitbon does not teach a network wherein the processor is configured for translating more than one call to a lightweight protocol message using a lightweight protocol message received from the first node.

31.   Beddus teaches a network wherein the processor is configured for translating more than one call to a lightweight protocol message using a lightweight protocol message received from the first node (Figure 6, 7 , 8, column 7, line 42-54 – where the first ldap message is sent to register the user profile). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sitbon to include Beddus' multiple call translation functionality so the client can easily communicate with an LDAP server to update his profile which aids in the establishment of setting up calls to be translated to the server.

32.   As to claim 12, Sitbon does not teach a network wherein the processor is further configured for translating the call to a lightweight protocol message using a plurality of lightweight protocol message received from the first node.

33.   Beddus teaches a network wherein the processor is further configured for translating

the call to a lightweight protocol message using a plurality of lightweight protocol message

received from the first node (Figures 6, 7, 8 and column 7, line 42 to column 8, line 11 – where

plurality of messages from the first node register and subsequently update the user profile

which is used to establish a call and is translated to a lightweight protocol message). It would

have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include

Beddus' call translation functionality so the client can send a plurality of messages to the

server to update his profile which helps establish a connection to the server.

34.   As to claims 6-7 and 10-12, Sitbon does not explicitly show the use of a system area

network; however it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify Sitbon by including the use of a system area network in

view of Mastie for the same reasons set forth in claim 5, supra.

35.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitbon and

Mastie as applied to claim 5 above, in view of Buchanan et al (hereinafter Buchanan), U.S

Patent No. 6,665,674.

36.   Sitbon doesn't teach a network wherein the processor is further configured for

translating a plurality of calls to a single lightweight protocol message.

37.   Buchanan teaches a network wherein the processor is further configured for translating a plurality of messages to a single lightweight protocol message (column 8, lines 59-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sitbon to incorporate Buchanan's functionality of translating a plurality of messages into a single lightweight protocol message so messages between server and client can be accumulated and sent all at once in a single LDAP message after all the processing of the messages has been completed.

38.   As to claim 8, Sitbon does not explicitly show the use of a system area network; however it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sitbon by including the use of a system area network in view of Mastie for the same reasons set forth in claim 5, supra.

39.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitbon and Mastie as applied to claim 5 above, in view of Seshadri et al (hereinafter Seshadri), U.S Patent No. 6,615,201, in further view of Ram et al (hereinafter Ram), U.S Patent No. 6,625,258.

40.   Sitbon does not disclose a network wherein the processor is further configured for translating the call to a plurality of lightweight protocol messages.

41.   Seshadri teaches a network wherein the processor is further configured for translating

the call to a plurality of SNMP protocol messages (column 5, lines 6-8 and 15-17 where the

network element is the processor). Seshadri does not teach translating the call to a plurality

of lightweight protocol messages. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sitbon to include Seshadri's

functionality of translating a call into a plurality of messages so the call can be executed

sequentially in a series of messages.

42.   Ram teaches that LDAP protocol can be interchangeably used with SNMP protocol

(column 8, lines 20-22). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art to modify Sitbon and Seshadri's implementation so the processor could translate a call to

a plurality of lightweight protocol messages as well as SNMP messages to increase the

robustness of the implementation by increasing the compatibility with a wider range of

protocols.

43.   As to claims 9, Sitbon does not explicitly show the use of a system area network;

however it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Sitbon by including the use of a system area network in view

of Mastie for the same reasons set forth in claim 5, supra.

44.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitbon and

Mastie as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Subramaniam.

45.   As to claim 13, Sitbon teaches a network wherein the application node for processing

the call if the file descriptor is of a second type (column 3, lines 1-25 and lines 57-67) but does

not explicitly teach using an operating system in the application node.

46.   Subramaniam teaches that it is well known in the art for an application node (server

in Sitbon) to contain an operating system (column 12, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Sitbon's

call processing method using an operating system at the application node as the system

would help in the operation of the application node.

47.   As to claim 13, Sitbon does not explicitly show the use of a system area network;

however it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Sitbon by including the use of a system area network in view

of Mastie for the same reasons set forth in claim 5, supra.

48.   Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitbon

and Mastie as applied to claim 16 above, in view of Subramaniam.

49.   As to claim 17, Sitbon teaches an apparatus further comprising processing the call at

the application node if the call and file descriptor are of a second type (column 3, lines 1-25

and lines 57-67) but does not explicitly teach using an operating system in the application node.

50.   Subramaniam teaches that an application node (server in Sitbon) contains an operating system (column 12, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Sitbon's call processing method using an operating system in the apparatus as the operating system would help in the operation of the application node and also well known and expected in the art for Sitbon's server node to contain a processor with an operating system.

51.   As to claim 18, Sitbon teaches an apparatus further comprising assigning the file descriptor (column 3, lines 1-8 and lines 47-57) but does not explicitly teach using an operating system to assign the file descriptor.

52.   Subramaniam teaches that an application node (server in Sitbon) contains an operating system (column 12, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Sitbon's file descriptor method using an operating system in the apparatus as the operating system would help in the operation of the application node and also well known and expected in the art for Sitbon's server node to contain a processor with an operating system.

53.   Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitbon and

Mastie as applied to claim 20 above, in view of Subramaniam.

54.   Sitbon teaches an article further comprising instructions for causing the computer

system to process the call using the application node (column 3, lines 1-25 and lines 57-67) but

does not explicitly teach using an operating system in the application node.

55.   Subramaniam teaches that it is well known in the art for an application node (server

in Sitbon) to contain an operating system (column 12, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Sitbon's

call processing method using an operating system at the application node as the system

would help in the operation of the application node.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art in regards to

filtering calls in networks:

> U.S Patent No. 6,154,743 to Leung et al;
>
> U.S Patent No. 6,192,362 to Schneck et al;
>
> U.S Patent No. 6,212,550 to Segur;
>
> U.S Patent No. 6,480,901 to Weber et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is (703)305-8864. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**

DC